



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/586,470

07/18/2006

Tim Jungkamp

12810-00322-US1

4266

30678

7590

09/09/2009

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 EYE STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1100

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

KOSACK, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/09/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/586,470	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JUNGKAMP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joseph R. Kosack	<b>Art Unit</b> 1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the instant application.

#### ***Previous Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-10 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drinkard et al. (USPN 3,356,748) in view of Fischer et al. (USPN 6,242,633) and Jungkamp et al. (WO 02/26698).

The Applicant has traversed the rejection on the grounds that the Drinkard et al. reference, alone or in combination, does not teach steps c and d, and that no reason to combine the references was provided.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, although Drinkard et al. do not teach the distillation steps, the Examiner showed in Jungkamp et al. that the distillation steps are taught and that it could be applied to the product stream of Drinkard et al. in order to generate the instant invention. The Examiner also cited the motivation that the distillation technique of Jungkamp et al. could be used by the person of ordinary skill in order to separate any mixture of pentenenitrile isomers, such as the mixture provided by the process of Drinkard et al.

Therefore, the Applicant's arguments have been considered fully, but have not been found to be persuasive. The rejection is maintained.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1626

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drinkard et al. (USPN 3,356,748) in view of Fischer et al. (USPN 6,242,633) and Jungkamp et al. (WO 02/26698).

The claims are drawn to a process for preparing 3-pentenitrile by isomerizing 2-methyl-3-butenitrile over a catalyst and distilling the products away from each other. A dependent claim details that the 2-methyl-3-butenitrile is generated by hydrocyanation of 1,3-butadiene and separating the reaction products by distillation.

Drinkard et al. teach the isomerization of 2-methyl-3-butenenitrile over a tetrakis(triethyl phosphite) nickel(0) catalyst in order to generate 3-pentenitrile. See column 4, Example 1.

Drinkard et al. do not teach where the product nitriles are separated from each other by distillation and where the reactant stream comes from the hydrocyanation of 1,3-butadiene.

Fischer et al. teach the hydrocyanation reaction of 1,3-butadiene with a nickel phosphite catalyst to form pentenenitriles which include 2-methyl-3-butenitrile. See Example 15, column 21.

Jungkamp et al. teach the azeotropic distillation of various pentenenitrile isomers. See page 2, line 39 through page 3, line 6 and Table 1, page 7. Jungkamp et al. do not teach the exact pairs of isomers that are listed in claim 1 nor does Jungkamp et al. teach the exact reactions that the mixtures come from.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to take the method proven by Jungkamp et al. and apply it to other mixtures of pentenenitrile isomers as distillation techniques such as simple distillation, fractional distillation, vacuum distillation, and azeotropic distillation are well known in the art and are readily applied by the person of ordinary skill in purifying isomeric liquids from one another. As to the reaction that the mixtures come from, one of skill in the art would be able to complete the distillation irrespective for which reaction the mixture of pentenenitriles originated from.

Therefore the claims are *prima facie* obvious over the prior art.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 1-10 are rejected.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Kosack whose telephone number is (571)272-5575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph R Kosack/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1626

/REI-TSANG SHIAO /  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626